

KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



OTHER PROFESSIONALS

STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

MEETING DATE: October 28, 2013

NOTE-TAKER/CONTACT: Monica Raines

Facilitator: Greg Ross

KDE Staff: Greg Ross, Todd Baldwin, Robin Chandler, Kathy Mansfield, Jennifer Smith, Cathy White

| Participant | District |
|----------------------|------------------|
| 1. Omar Morris | Jefferson Count |
| 2. Beth Edmonson | Daviess County |
| 3. Paul Baker | Martin County |
| 4. Dana Logsdon | Fayette County |
| 5. Laura Cullens | Jefferson County |
| 6. Debbie Culler | Fayette County |
| 7. Tim Ball | Rowan County |
| 8. Paul Lantana | Jefferson County |
| 9. Sheri Hoza | Jefferson County |
| 10. Stephanie Little | KEDC |
| 11. Greta Stanfield | Mason County |
| | |

Introductions: Greg Ross gave greetings and an overview of the agenda

Agenda Item:

Discussion/Action:

Key Questions/Concerns:

C – Committee

D – Department

Agenda Item: Updates

Discussion/Action: Todd Baldwin gave updates on the Teacher Steering Committee meeting discussions

Agenda Item: Review Samples of Student Growth Goals *See handout*

Discussion/Action: Develop guiding principles around the development of Student Growth Goals

Committee breaks up into small groups

Key Questions/Concerns:

C- Group 1. Speech Language Pathologist (SLP) – Not necessarily a goal, but an idea. The person doing the evaluation should have training or background on what they are evaluating. An SLP has got to be able to evaluate the skills of an SLP.

D – 1. Almost impossible

2. We understand the concern in reference to evaluation, but don't think this has a big impact on the goal unless you think you can't create or sustain a goal unless the person evaluating you has an understanding of what you do

C – We are tying it to student growth. If the student is evaluated and identified with certain disabilities, and the SLP is working with the student and uses the wrong approach, the student will not make it. The evaluator must have certain background in able to see this.

D- There should be a peer component where a person has the same background and give feedback?

C – Group 2 School Psychologists. It would be more beneficial to us to be associated with a school wide or district wide growth.

D – You said using school or district based assessments; are you looking at your students that receive services?

C – The students we test are mostly students being tested for potential special Ed services. These students may not be making growth.

Sub-groups will establish parameters around each / all points of evidence

Student Growth Goal

- (SP) like the rubric model (not met)
 - But how
 - Goals are written with up to four benchmarks
 - Even if goal wasn't met, how many benchmarks were not

Where? 

| | | | | | |
|---|---------|-----------|--------|-----|---|
| { | O | 1 | 2 | 3 | } |
| | Not met | partially | barely | met | |

- Documentation of adverse effect
 - Making sure goal is tangible

School Psych

- School / District
- Measured by assessment

Guidance Counselor

- Based on enduring skill
- Set with principal
- Who? Based on contact

What I know about Student Voice Surveys

Most of the committee has heard of it

Agenda Item: Introduction to Student Surveys *See flipchart notes, recommendations and handouts*

Discussion/Action: Greg, Todd and Cathy discussed Student Surveys with the Committee

Key Questions/Concerns:

D – We can provide models from other states (Delaware) for you to react to see if these fit. We may be able to find additional resources if we can post a few models from groups on how they are split, let you respond if one works well or make modifications.

Recommendations

- A peer component attached

(Sample guidance / goals)

They would like to know how other states are implementing

- All groups will have the same points of evidence(s), but different bullets (directives) under each point

Next meeting

- What do our sub-groups look like?

We will break up into sub-groups

- These sub-groups will build the growth

goal process for each subgroup

- Consider a peer component by role group
 - Each role group would define the guiding principles
 - Peer process is protected, will only be formative
- OT/PT will follow same cycle evaluation as teachers

Agenda Item:

Discussion/Action:

Key Questions/Concerns:

Next meeting date: